(*I may explain that Mr. Hurst, son of the well-known Methodist Bishop, had been Consul-General at Vienna, and was summarily discharged without explanation or assignment of cause and his place given to another man. He appealed to me to in terest myself in his defence, and I wrote to the President and Senator Hanna about him. Subsequently he was appointed Consul at La Guayra

Shortly after writing this I received another letter from the President, written before mine to him could have been received, on December 30, 1903, three days after the first and still more astonishing. I quote the portions referring to this matter:

The President to Mr. Storer.

Let me repeat to you that in reference to matters affecting the Catholic Church events have absolutely shown that while you are Ambassador you must keep absolutely clear of any deed or word in Rome or elsewhere which would seem to differentiate your position from that of other Ambassadors. The mere fact of a report in the newspapers about your calling at the Vatican had a very unfor tunate effect. I dare say you did not call You may merely have seen some Cardinal privately, but the unpleasant talk over the affair emphasizes the need of extreme circumspection while you are in your present position. While I am President and you are Ambassador neither of us in his public relation is to act as Catholic or Protestant. Jew or Gentile, and we have to be careful not merely to do what is right but so to carry ourselves as to show that we are doing what right. I shall ask you not to quote me to any person in any shape or way in connection with any affair of the Catholic Church and yourself not to take action of any kind which vill give ground for the belief that you as an American Ambassador are striving to inter fere in the affairs of the Church. "BESOLVED TO REPUDIATE MY ACTION."

This letter, with its virtual assertion that my visit to the Vatican was not only unauthorized, but was so contrary to what could have been expected that the President hardly then believed that it had occurred, was unintelligible except on the theory that he had resolved to repudiate all authority for my action, and to appear ignorant of it, and was now writing a letter which would be serviceable if needed later as evidence to support that position. In fact, this was the use to which the letter was afterward actually put by him in quoting it to persons not informed of the facts, as will appear later. I felt that the only thing for me to do in this situation was to tender my resignation at once, and that I immediately did, accompanying it by a say that I can find no copy. To this I received the following reply:

The President to Mr. Storer. WHITE HOUSE,

WASHINGTON, Jan. 29, 1904. DEAR BELLAMY: I have your letter. It is absolutely all right; we will treat the incident as closed. Nothing could persuade me to accept your resignation, old fellow, and I am sure John Hay feels as I do. When I see you I shall explain, as I do not like to do on paper, both how full had been the steps taken by Hay in investigating the matter, and the use that was made against your letter. I shall give Hay your note. Faithfully yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT. With this the incident closed I had followed exactly the President's request in seeing Pope Pius X. I had reported to him in detail my interview; I had put it squarely to him that I had done nothing beyond what he had asked me to do, and he had thereupon left the subject, not disavowing his authority nor dissenting from my statement. I accordingly accepted as sincere the cordial expressions with which he refused to accept my resignation, as it was apparent that his irritation had been caused, not by my acts, but by the publicity which had unfortunately been given to things which he wished to have done but wished to be kept secret. The President never alluded to any phase of this matter again until two years later, when, in pressing for my resignation, he quoted to my wife these letters of December, 1903, as evidence that he had then been displeased by my con-

ROOSEVELT HADN'T CHANGED IN 1904. During the two years from January, 1904, to December, 1905, matters of the

Catholic Church were not brought into our correspondence. I continued to be on the same terms of close intimacy with the President as before, and his letters and interviews showed the same apparent friendship and confidence. His attitude toward Archbishop Ireland and the possible appointment of the Archbishop to the office of Cardinal evidently remained unchanged, for shortly after writing to me his letter of December 30, 1903, given above, he talked with the Archbishop about the newspaper article inquired how it could have got into print referred to the letter just written to Mr Storer, expressed his confidence in Mr. Storer and his hope that the outcome of Mr. Storer's mission would be what all desired and repeated his expression of friendship for the Archbishop, referring to his message sent through me to the Pope with no sign of change of feeling, though regretting the publicity which had followed. My authority for this statement is a letter written to me by Archbishop Ireland at the time (February 2, 1904). may recall without impropriety the facts that during 1904 the Presidential campaign was in progress and that Archbishop Ireland was a Republican deservedly having great influence over the immense body of Roman Catholic voters in the West, so that cordial relations with him and a readiness to be of assistance in his expected promotion to still higher influence were very natural on the President's part, aside

the Archbishop. In the summer of 1904 I was in the United States on leave of absence from my post, and in October I was, with my wife, a guest at the White House. During that visit the President spoke to me with great warmth of Archbishop Ireland, desiring his elevation to the Cardinal's office, and always without suggestion of any dissa isfaction with what had been previously done by me toward that end. On the evening of October 20 he made to my wife remarks on the subject which were so significant that she immediately made a memorandum of them. That memorandum I have found, and it is

from the personal friendliness which, as

the President always declared, he felt for

Mrs. Storer's Memerandum

WHITE HOUSE The President told me he had said to Cardinal Satelli that he wondered if the Vatican appreciated the influence and position of Archbishop Ireland in the United States. He said to Cardinal Satolli, "I consult Archbishop Ireland and lean upon him for support in every issue that involves the Catholic Church in America and in every question which concerns the Church in the Philip-pides." The President said that Cardinal Satolli smiled blandly and said not a word, so that it seemed uncertain if he had clearly

The President inquired, however, a few days later of Monsignor O'Connell and found that Satolli had reported verbatim to him the conversation and had written a letter about

it to the Vatican. President said: "I do most sincerely hope that Archbishop Ireland may be made

Liberal rates of interest allowed on funds held awaiting suitable investment.

> The Trust Company of America

135 Broadway, New York 95 Grenham St., London, E. C. 36 Wall St., New York CAPITAL AND SURPLUS \$12,500,000.

a Cardinal at the next consistory. Nothing ould help me more in matters connected with the Church here and in the Philippines. I have done everything and said every-thing which it is possible for me to say and do in the matter. I certainly said enough to Cardinal Satolli (without mentioning the Cardinal's hat, which of course I could not do) to show my wishes and desires should the Pope see fit to gratify them."

I am informed that Cardinal Satolli at once reported to the Pope the President's conversation with him, as the President

evidently intended him to do. Immediately after the election of November, 1904, I wrote to the President making formal tender of my resignation, as is usually done by Ambassadors and Ministers on the eve of a change in administration, in order that the new President may be free to make a new appointment if he wishes. To this I received the following reply:

The President to Mr. Storer.

WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, Jan. 9, 1905. DEAR BELLAMY: I accept your resignation and shall reappoint you as Ambassador to Vienna-unless, on talking it over with John Hav, it seems best simply not to accept the

Whether I can later transfer you elsewhere er not I do not know. If I am not able to, it may be that I shall want after, say, three years to put in Charles S. Francis, ex-Minister to -son of Francis who was Minister to Vienna for a year. He was a good man in the diplomatic service. He has a great senti-mental desire to succeed his father in Austria and did substantial work in this last campaign may not want to do this, but it is possible that I should like to. With best wishes faithfully yours. Theodore Roosevelt.

I never received any other answer than this to my letter of resignation, which remained unacted on, and I continued as Ambassador without reappointment. At letter to the President of which I regret to any time thereafter my letter could have been acted on and my place vacated by a simple communication to me accepting the resignation, for nothing more was needed from me to put my place at the immediate disposal of the Government.

Nothing was done at Rome respecting the appointment of any American to the office of Cardinal, notwithstanding earlier intimations that Archbishop Ireland was to be appointed, and toward the end of 1905 t was reported in Rome that this was because the President had caused it to be known there that he now favored the appointment of Archbishop Farley. This rumor was hardly credible, but, as it was currently circulated and believed in Rome, t seemed to call for notice. Accordingly Mrs. Storer wrote to the President on November 20, 1905, the following letter, calling his attention to the report

Mrs. Storer to the President.

AMERICAN EMBASSY.

VIENNA, Nov. 20, 1905. DEAR THEODORE: I want to write to you n confidence of something which I have heard from Rome, Princess Alexandrine Win-

disch-Graetz has told me. She knew the Pope very well in Venice when he was Patriarch and has seen him often since at the Vatican. About eighteen months ago the Pope told her that he intended to appoint Archbishop Ireland Cardinal. He said: "Ho studiato la causa: sara fatto" ("I have studied the question. It shall be done"). The Pope went on to say that there would be no consistory that year and perhaps not before the appointment was a certainty because the Pope believed it would please the American non-

Catholies and the American President. Everything seemed settled, when Cardinal Merry del Val (who is personally not friendly to Archbishop Ireland because of the Archhishon's patriotism during our war with Spain) announced that "The President of the United States has asked for the elevation of two Archbishops, therefore he cannot care very much about either."

PHILBIN WENT TO THE POPE?

It is said that a Mr. Philbin went to Rome with a request from you that Archbishop Farley should be raised to the Cardinalate This has wiped out Archbishop Ireland without promoting the Archbishop of New York. The diocese of New York represents (as it did in the lifetime of Archbishop Corrigan) the foreign and reactionary spirit which is hurtful to our country and hosile to our schools and institutions. I cannot believe that you have asked for recognition of this element, and that Archbishop Ireland's great work should reap no harves; of future influence would be a mis fortune to the American Republic. If this right. I could take a cable from you to Rome hand without Cardinal Merry del Val's knowlreally. Please do not be angry with me for writing to you about this. You know that ou can trust me. We are of one mind atthough of different creeds. Always faffec-

MARIA LONGWORTH STORER. A few days later Mrs. Storer wrote to Judge Taft a confidential letter of the same import as the above, of which, however, have no copy. In that letter were enclosed copies of three letters which Mrs. Storer had received, one from the Princess Alexandrine Windisch-Graetz, one from Cardinal Merry del Val and one from Archbishop Keane. As later these enclosures were made the subject of comment by the President, I attach copies of the first two. (See Nos. 1 and 2 appended.) I have

no copy of Archbishop Kedne's letter. It appears that the letter of Mrs. Storer to Judge Taft was shown not only to the President, but to Mr. Root, who had then become Secretary of State. Mr. Root, I may point out, was probably ignorant of what had been previously done by me and others in Church matters during the secre-

taryship of his predecessor, Mr. Hay. While Mrs. Storer's letter was on its way she received a letter from the President which, though it has no immediate bearing upon the matters now under discussion, I will quote as showing that the President could then have been feeling no dissatisfaction with my official conduct, but was proposing to give me fresh marks of his ap-

The President to Mrs. Storer.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 24, 1905. DEAR MARIA-All right; in the event of the marriage of the King of Spain, Bellamy shall be made special Ambassador. I shall see that the State Department gives nothing to if he comes over here. With love to

Bellamy, ever yours.
THEODORE ROOSEVELT. The response to Mrs. Storer's letter came from the President in the form of two letters to which I ask careful attention, as they became the basis of the President's action in removing me from my post. They came

"strictly personal." The first of these was addressed to me, and was as follows: The President to Mr. Storer.

WRITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, Dec. 11, 1905. MY DEAR BELLAMY: I am very sorry to have to write as I do in the enclosed letter o Mrs. Storer, which I shall ask you to read and then hand to her I have been most reluctant to write as I herein write; I am deeply attached to both of you; but it is evident that I cannot longer delay using the plainest kind of language, for it is evident that such plain language is necessary to prevent the American Government from being put in a false and wholly improper position

Sincerely yours, THEODORE ROOSEVELT. The second letter, which was enclosed in that just given, was addressed to Mrs. Storer. It is so long that I refrain from giving it in full here, but refer to the copy which I attach, and ask that it be carefully read in the light of the occurrences which preceded it, of which I have given the history above. (See No. 3 appended.)

RESENTS CHARGE AGAINST WIFE. I cannot trust myself to express fully the feeling of indignation with which I read the letter addressed to Mrs. Storer. Though I was in the public service, I felt, and still feel, that I had lost none of the rights which a man has to judge of the propriety of letters addressed to his wife and to resent an improper communication. I did not then know, what I have since learned, that the letter was not even written for my wife's eyes or mine alone, but had been shown to others before it was sent, and thus used to make a case against a lady, a trusting friend, who could not be heard in her own defence. My wife was deliberately accused of having quoted isolated sentences from the President's letters to convince other persons that he was doing exactly what, as he asserts, he had explicitly stated in writing that he would not do. This charge of shameful conduct was based on no evidence which could even have misled the writer into a hasty judgment, but was in answer to a letter which, whether approved or not, at least furnishes no such evidence either in itself or in its enclosures. The tone of long suffering and outraged patience, the careful omis sion of all mention of anything that the writer had himself done and authorized to be done in the matters complained of, the quotations from the letters written at the time of my errand to the Pope, without any of the facts and circumstances related above which would give those letters their true character or show that they were an angry complaint because what he had directed to be done had become known-these things, with the abusive personal characterization of my wife, and the assumed indignation with what had been, in fact, per mitted and encouraged where not expressly directed, seemed to me to put the letter outside the limit of anything justifiable even in a stranger. What a sense of outraged friendship it aroused in us can perhaps be understood by any one who has read even the small part of the private correspond-

ence given above. The President's letter begins by characterizing Mrs. Storer's letter in a way which could hardly give a fair idea of its character to one who had not seen it. Her letter is given above, and reference to it will show whether it proposed that Mrs. Storer should be authorized to go to Rome to drag the United States Government into an intrigue. Such a proposal might well have been 'astounding." But why should the President have been astounded at a suggestion that Mrs. Storer should be intrusted to take to the Pope a private message from him which should deny that the President had interfered to procure the appointment of Archbishop Farley? The President had already done far more than that in sending, through me and others, affirmative personal messages in favor of Archbishop Ireland;

but no allusion to this appears in the letter. The assertion that Mrs. Storer's letter to Mr. Taft "if published" would misrepresent both the President and the American Government, again, is not borne out by anything that Mrs. Storer wrote to Judge Taft and the President's indignant denial of he right to "meddle" is inconsistent with the previous history of these matters. Mrs. Storer's letters to Cardinal Merry del Val and the Princess Alexandrine are spoken of as "utterly improper" and "intolerable. which would carry the impression that the President had seen what he condemned; but he had never seen them. The Princess Alexandrine was not in public life, and Mrs. Storer's letter to her was part of a private correspondence between two ladies. which I should have thought beyond the range of such comment. The letter to the Cardinal, while it did concern the promotion of Archbishop Ireland, was written by my wife as a private person to an officer of her Church. If copies of these letters had been kept I should gladly have produced them; but none were taken. I may say positively, however, that neither of them made any allusion to Mr. Roosevelt.

THE PRESIDENT GUILTY IF ANY ONE. The President's statement that, though ap proached by many persons, he had refused to "interfere" by requesting an appointment, is to be taken in connection with what he admits that he did say to such persons, namely, that he would be delighted to see Archbishop Ireland promoted. With that admission the President has stated his position substantially as both I and Mrs. Storer have always understood it, and the "outrage" of which he says Mrs. Storer had been guilty was never committed. What the President has said to many people appears; more than this neither Mrs. Storer nor have ever attributed to him. I wish to be as precise and emphatic as possible in this denial. We have neither of us ever represented to any person, by word or letter, that the President requested anything from the Vatican, or put him in the attitude of exerting pressure or a preference for one candidate rather than another or of doing or saying anything officially, or as if with the Government behind him and the statement that Mrs. Storer had written letters conveying a wrong impression of his attitude is a wholly incorrect characterization of letters which the President had never seen. We have repeated to prelates of the Church, including the Pope, expressions of the President, but only expressions of the precise character which he admits in this letter he was in the habit of making to many persons, and we have always done this with full regard for the distinction which the President points out between private wishes and official requests. We repeated those expressions because they were used to us with the unmistakable purpose that we should repeat them, and, at least in one instance, with the express request that I should repeat them to the Pope; and what the President has said and done with me he has said and done with other members of our Church, including prelates, whom he certainly expected to be influenced by his expressions and to quote them, as no doubt those per-sons have done. The President refers to the letter of Cardinal Merry del Val as a rebuke to Mrs. Storer. Whether it is so can be judged by referring to the copy given herewith. Certainly neither this nor other letters from the Cardinal or from

any other authority ever conveyed to us

speaks of what he had been continually hearing about Mrs. Storer for the last couple of years, as if he had been for that period displeased by her conduct; and yet we had never had an intimation of this, but, on the contrary, his letter written three weeks before, on November 20, quoted above, conveyed to us a strong evidence of his approal. He asserts that he had been unofficially informed on behalf of Berlin and of Paris that it would not be agreeable, because of Mrs. Storer's actions, to have me as Ambassador in either place. I know nothing about Berlin, but I have taken gains to learn whether this was true of Paris, and it is explicitly denied by M. Jusserand in a recent

M. Jusserand to Mrs. Storer.

44 RUE HAMELIN, July 20, 1906. DEAR MRS. STORER: I have the same answer to make to your letter of the 19th, just received, as I made to your former one, and

the answer is: no, certainly not. Neither Mr. Delcassé nor any one asked me to make any representations at the State Department or elsewhere to prevent Mr. Storer's being appointed to Paris, nor did I ever make any of any kind.

This new story with which I am very un-

duly associated is not truer than the other

and I sincerely hope there may be no more of the same sort. I have the honor of returning to you herewith Archbishop Ireland's letter which you had kindly sent for my perusal and I beg you to believe me, respectfully yours, JUSSERAND. A similar denial has been made by M. Delcassé who recently, on April 24, 1906, assured Archbishop Ireland that never during his ministry did the French Government express itself in opposition to Mr. Storer, and added that, on the contrary, he

had expected Mr. Storer's nomination

and would have been happy to receive it,

and M. Delcassé voluntarily authorized the

repetition in any quarter of what he had The President adds a postscript in which he quotes from letters written to Mrs Storer in December, 1903. Those are the letters referred to above as written to me at the time of the newspaper report of my audience with Pope Pius X., spoken of above. The quotation from the letter of Decemper 19, 1903, shows that the President said to Mgr. O'Connell, "Personally I have a very strong friendship and admiration for the Archbishop and that individually it would please me greatly to see him made a Cardinal." More than this we have never attributed to the President, and have always known well, that he "could not, as President, in any way try to help any clergy man,"and have respected that caution; and indeed it is hard to understand how any person of experience could expect from any President the sort of interference that he so emphatically refuses. The letters of December 27 and December 30, 1903, are fully discussed above, in connection with my errand to the Pope. That the letters were written in angry displeasure because a newspaper had by some means discovered what the President had expressly ordered

to be done-this, as I have already ob-

served, does not appear, and presumably

was not known to the members of the Cabi-

WHY REPLY TO A LETTER TO HIS WIFE? To the President's letter addressed to me I made no reply. It is my failure to answer this and another letter which soon fol lowed that has now been officially given out as the reason for my removal from office. As to that letter, it will be observed that it not only does not in terms call for an answer but opens no subject which involved an answer from me. It merely covers an enclosure addressed to my wife, and it is my wife who is asked to reply to the enclosure. Moreover, the letter to me is not only marked "strictly personal," but is definitely unofficial in character, addressed "Dear Bellamy," and is obviously a part of that voluminous personal correspondence with me, which, it must be borne in mind, had been actively going on for several years. The fact that it related, through the enclosure, to my wife's conduct in certo make it official if any distinction between personal and official communications referring to public matters exists. That distinction the President strongly insists upon respecting his own remarks in this very connection, and certainly if available for him it is available for me. If the distinction does not exist, or is not to be obmy wife have received, since I have been in the diplomatic service, a great number of letters from Mr. Roosevelt commenting on public men and public matters with such unrestrained freedom that to treat them as official would seem to me a staggering proposal. I am, however, quite ready to lay the entire correspondence before the State Department, or the Cabinet, if the President's view is that this correspondence is a part of my official business. At all events, I regarded the letter to me as private, to be answered or not as I might decide on personal grounds and on grounds of that character I decided not to answer it, as that seemed to me to be the most dignified way to treat a letter which could only be adequately answered by writing more plainly than I cared to trust myself to do.

I certainly could not knowingly have committed the unpardonable breach of official manners of leaving unnoticed an official letter from my Government.

But it is plain that it cannot be a mere literal failure to answer the letter addressed to me that is complained of. An answer confined to that could have been, at most, a mere acknowledgment of the receipt of the enclosure. It is the letter to my wife which alone is significant. At my request this letter was left unanswered by her.

SSUMES RESPONSIBILITY FOR WIFE'S FAIL-

URE TO ANSWER. Respecting this letter it is hard to understand the exact nature of the complaint that is made against me. As I have said, it was my wife who was addressed and from whom a categorical answer was asked. Is it now asserted that her failure to answer was my official misconduct? Such a contention puts the wife of an Ambassador and her correspondence in a new and singular light do not make this distinction between my wife and myself as a technical ground for evading responsibility. On the contrary, I assume the whole responsibility for her failure to answer, for, as I have said, it was by my request that she did not notice the letter; but I point out that the fact that the letter was addressed to her, concerned her conduct, and requested in terms a personal answer from her, and an answer which she alone could have given, justified me in dealing with the letter as one addressed definitely to my wife, and one wholly personal to her, though, of course, through her, personal to me. I was entitled, I insist, to determine what position to take respecting that letter by the feelings and rules of conduct which a gentleman in private life might apply to correspondence addressed to his wife, and my decision is to be judged accordingly. At all events, it was upon these considerations that I did act, and I had no hesitation in deciding that the letter should not be answered. The manner in which the subject was opened made discussion impossible. and it was plain that unless I was prepared under one and the same envelope marked the impression of a rebuke. The President to concur in a letter to be written by her,



HALE DESK CO., 15 STONE ST., next Produce Exchange

abjectly confessing misbehavior where none had been and promising to offend no further, there could be no answer which would not merely lead to still more angry correspondence. The result of silence I well understood might be that which the President had expressly stated in his letter -that my resignation would be asked for. That I was ready to face, for I preferred to leave the service rather than sacrifice self-respect in an attempt to save my place-an attempt which, even if I could have brought myself to make it, I was sure could not long have availed against a deliberate wish to have the place in order to give it to some one else. That I should be abruptly dismissed, as finally happened, did not, I admit, occur to me, though I cannot say that I should have changed my decision even to avert that. I had already sent in my resignation in January, 1905, and that resignation had been ever since then in the President's hands unacted on. My impulse was to leave to the President the responsibility of taking on his own motion the step which he threatened, rather than to adopt the alternative which he offered of sending in a second resignation, a step which, if unexplained would have been interpreted as an admission that I retired because my wife was not to be allowed to do in the Church what the President wrongly accused her of doing.

The President's two letters given above were received on December 26 and, as I have stated, were not answered Shortly after that day I went to Egypt on leave of absence granted by the State De

On February 3, 1906, the President wrote me a second letter as follows:

The President to Mr. Storer.

WRITE HOUSE. WASHINGTON, Feb. 3, 1906. MY DEAR BELLAMY: On December 11 last, nearly two months ago, I wrote you a letter enclosing one for Mrs. Storer. Both letters called for answers. I should like to have these answers as early as is convenient. Sincerely THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

This letter was sent to the address in Egypt which I had given to the State Department, and was received on February 26. It will be observed that, like the previous etter, it is marked "personal," and is addresed to me by my Christian name. If the designation means anything this letter

formed part of a non-official correspondence. Had I answered this letter instantly on its receipt the answer could not have reached Washington before March 14, allowing only sixteen days for the course of mail and of this, of course, the President must have been well aware, having sent his letter to Egypt. Without waiting for that time to elapse, however, the President sent to me on March 5 the following telegram, addressing it not to my address in Egypt, as in the case of the letter, but to Vienna, whence it was forwarded, by intermediate repetitions, to the address in Egypt which was my address in Egypt in the State Department:

The President to Mrs. Storer (telegram) Storer, American Ambassador, Vienna

You have not answered my letter of December !, although I supplemented it by another letter of February 3. I do not knoow whether this is because you do not wish to remain in the Diplo matic Service or are unwilling to comply with the requirements which I have stated. In either event I request your resignation as Ambassador. Theodore Roosevelt. On receipt of this telegram, without a moment's unnecessary delay. I complied with the request and tendered my resignation by the following letter:

On leave of absence in Egypt near Luxor, 7th March, 1996 The Hon, Elihu Root, Secretary of State: Str.-In obedience to the peremptors Vienna and Cairo I have the honor to tender

I beg that he be informed that it will give me pleasure to afford him any information or service in my power regarding his installation. I am, &c., &c., BELLAMY STORER My letter should have reached its destina tion, allowing the shortest interval for mail, not earlier than March 23. Without waiting for it, and before it possibly could

have arrived, the Department of State

Whoever may be designated my successor

on March 20 sent the following telegram addressed to me in Egypt: Secretary Root to Mr. Storer (telegram.) President desires me to inform you that you are recalled as Ambassador Austria-Hungary, and that your quality as such this day ceases. Letters of recall will be de-

livered by your successor.

This was followed, on receipt of my resignation, by the following letter confirming

Secretary Root to Mr. Storer.

WASHINGTON, March 26, 1906. Bellamy Storer, Esquire, Vienna, Austria. SIR-I have to acknowledge the receipt our letter of the 7th inst. in which you state that, in obedience to the peremptory telegran of the President just received by you, via Vienna and Cairo, you tender your resignation as Ambassador.

In reply I beg to say that before the receip of your letter your recall by the Presiden had already taken effect and your official character had ceased.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

ELIHU ROOT It will be seen that I was thus recalled after having complied punctiliously with the President's request by sending my resignation, and sending it for the second time, and that my removal was effected by a telegram while my letter of resignation, sent with all possible despatch, was on its way. That telegram was immediately followed by the President's sending to the Senate for appointment as Ambassador to Austria-Hungary the name of Hon. Charles S. Francis. This was the gentleman whom he had mentioned, it will be remembered, in his letter to me of January 9, 1905, as one who had done substantia work in the campaign, and for whom he might later wish my place.

"ATTEMPT TO DISCREDIT ME PERSONALLY." That nothing might be omitted in the attempt to discredit me publiely the following telegram was sent, on March 27, to the Foreign Department of the Austrian Gov-

TIFFANY & Co.

Pottery and Glass for Christmas Gifts

Exclusive exhibits: New effects in Tiffany Favrile Pottery and Glass, Ruskin Pottery in reproductions of "Ming" glazes and other early Chinese porcelains. Lancastrian "Lustre" Ware, in the style of Hispano-Moresques, designed by Walter Crane and Lewis F. Day. Rookwood Pottery in "Iris," "Vellum," "Sea Green" and "Tiger Eye" varieties. Royal Copenhagen, Holland Delft, Webb's Rock Crystal, etc.

Pottery and Glass Department, Third Floor

Fifth Avenue & 37th Street.

LINCOLN TRUST COMPANY

MADISON SQUARE, NEW YORK

BROADWAY & 724 ST. BROADWAY & LISPENARD ST.

Present money market conditions enable this Company to offer exceptionally lavorable rates of interest for surplus funds on demand or time deposit.

ernment, addressed to Count Goluchowski: I have the honor to advise your Excellency that the President has been pleased to terminate at once, and without any such delay as would be incident to the transmission of a letter of recall by mail, the authority of his Ambassador, Mr. Bellamy Storer, to represen him. The President has accordingly recalled Mr. Storer, whose representative functions have already ceased. This action will be supplemented by a formal letter of recall which already has been signed and will be presented to you in accordace with former custom in such matters. The Secretary of Embassy at Vienna, Mr. G. R. Rives, has been named Chargé d'Affaires. I reques your. Excellency to receive him and treat with him in that capacity

This telegram, sent as if in an emergency, and apparently to meet the danger into which I might plunge the Government by holding myself out at Vienna for a few days longer as clothed with the authority of an Ambassador, is unprecedented, so far as I am aware, in diplomatic usage.

NO INTERPERENCE BY MRS. STORER IN FRENCH POLITICS.

No reason for my summary discharge was vouchsafed me, nor was any given out in any responsible way. Newspaper correspondents in Washington published statements obtained from sources to which they had access, saying that it was because of my wife's "interference" in affairs of the Roman Catholic Church, and her misuse of letters from the President, but nothing appeared in such a way that I could answer it. I later learned indirectly that the President was making another charge against Mrs. Storer, this being that she had meddled with French politics by taking part in an anti-Republican intrigue to promote the marriage of Victor Bonaparte with a member of the Orleanist family. This charge the President evidently repeated to mempers of his Cabinet, for one of them has lately referred to it, and has said that he had been given to understand that the French Ambassador in Washington was the authority for it. The accusation was absolutely false. Neither Mrs. Storer nor I had ever been parties to any such plan, or had any sympathy with it, or any knowledge of its existence beyond what was rumored in the newspapers. Had that charge been seasonably brought to my notice, as I venture to say should have been done before giving it credence, we could have proved at once its absolute untruth. In order to fix, if possible, the authority for the false charge, Mrs. Storer applied in July last to the French Ambassador, and I give a copy of his reply: M. Jusserand to Mrs. Storer.

44 RUE HAMBLIN, 7th July, 1906.
DEAR MRS. STORER: I have received your letter informing me that through differen sources in America you have heard me quoted as the authority for a statement according to which you have interested yourself in Prince Victor Napoleon and the Imperialis party in France. You ask me from what ource I may have derived such a story.

I have only this to say: The statement s entirely false; I have never said to any one what your informants are pleased to attribute to me. I never connected you in any fashion whatsoever, by word of mouth or otherwise, with Prince Victor and his party, nor ever said anything which could be construed as having any such meaning. I am as surprised at your correspondent statements as you may have been, and I thank you for having given me this opportunity of most emphatically denying them. I have the honor to be, dear Mrs. Storer, Very sincerely yours, JUSSERAND.

Finally, in order to elicit some definite statement of the charges against me, I sent to the Secretary of State on June 23 the following letter:

Mr. Storer to Secretary Root. June 23, 1906.

To the Hon. Elihu Root, Secretary of State, Washington:

SIR-Your telegram announcing to me m removal from office-without reference to my resignation previously forwarded-and your letter acknowledging the receipt of my resignation, were accompanied by no explanation or reason for this action of the Depart-

After some necessary uncertainty as to my plans, I find my return to the United States will be delayed for a month or more. therefore address you by letter, believing that I am entitled to have exactly the reasons both of the President's wish to remove me from the service and of the manner in which this removal was effected. I request that I be informed of the grounds of both, by the Department in writing. This information I ask may be given me

in as full detail as possible. My address is "care Morgan, Harjes & Co., Paris." Your obt. servant, Bellamy Stores.

To this I received the following reply: Assistant Secretary Bacon to Mr. Storer.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, July 18, 1906. SIR: In reply to your letter of June 28 I

follows: On December 11, 1905, the President wrote you on a matter of great importance involving your retention in the service, a letter which called for an immediate answer. If you chose not to answer it the only proper course open to you, consistent with the demands alike of personal and official propriety, was immediately to resign your position as Ambassador. You, however, left the letter unanswered, and indeed without even ac knowledgment of its receipt. After waiting about two months without receiving an answer the President-because of his desire to treat you with the utmost consideration instead of removing you, wrote you again on February 3, 1906. This second letter you also left ananswered and without any acknowledgment of its receipt. After waiting a month, on March 5, 1906, the following telegram was sent you

Storer, American Ambassador, Vienna. You have not answered my letter of December 11, although I supplemented it by another letter of cause you do not wish to remain in the diplomati service or are unwilling to comply with the requirements which I have stated. In either event, request your resignation as Ambassador.

to resign: a further act of consideration on the part of the Administration.

In view of your failure to answer either of the letters referred to above, it was clearly your duty, unless you expected the Department to believe that you intended to leave this telegram likewise unanswered, to acknowledge it by cable You did not thus acknowledge it. After waiting two weeks without receiving any answer, by which time three months and a half had elapsed without any answer from you to the original letter, six weeks without any answer from you to the second letter, and fortnight without any answer from you to the telegram, you were notified by cable of your removal. This for the first time drew afterward your letter of resignation was

As you had aleady been removed and your successor's nomination sent to the Senate, no further action about you was possible even if, which was not the case, it had been desired by the Department or the Administra tion to take such further action. Yours

Acting Secretary of State. COULDN 'T HAVE TELEGRAPHED RESIGNATION

By this letter my recall is put solely upon the ground of a gross neglect of correspondence in failing to answer two letters and a telegram addressed to me on official business. Nothing is said of the letter to my wife or of the character of either of the let ters. / Whether the letter of December 11, 1905, to me "called for immediate answer. or called for any answer. I have discussed above. It seems that I am now charged with neglect in not answering by cable instead of by letter the telegram of March 5 demanding my resignation. It is enough to reply to this that I did not telegraph my resignation because I was not asked to do so, and to have done it of my own motion would have been contrary not only to usage but to the rule expressly laid down by the State Department. The "Regulation for Diplomatic Officers," issued by the State

"PROUD AND GLAD" Because Mother Looked So [Well After Quit-

An Ohio woman was almost distracted with coffee dyspepsia and heart trouble. Like thousands of others, the drug in coffee caffeine was slowly but steadily undermining her nervous system and interfering with natural digestion of food.

"For 30 years," she writes, "I have used coffee. Have always been sickly—had heart trouble and dyspensia with ulcers in

heart trouble and dyspepsia with ulcers in stomach and mouth so bad sometimes. I was almost distracted and could hardly eat a thing for a week. "I could not sleep for nervousness, and when I would lie down at night I'd belch up

coffee and my heart would trouble me-last, when I would want to drink coffee, would gag me. It was like poison to mewould gag me. It was like poison to me. I was thin—only weighed 125 pounds, when I quit coffee and began to use Postum.

"From, the first day that belching and burning in my stomach stopped. The Postum went down so easy and pleasant. I could sleep as soundly as anyone and, after the first month, whenever I met any friends they would ask me what was making me so fleshy and look so well.

"Sometimes, before I could answer quick enough, one of the children or my husband would say, 'Why, that is what Postum is doing for her'—they were all so proud and glad.

"When I recommend it to anyone I always tell them to follow directions in make ing Postum, as it is not good to taste if weak, but fine when it is boiled long enough to got the flavor and rich brown color." Name

given by Postum Co., Battle Creek, Read the little book, "The Road to ville," in pkgs. "There's a Reason."